

08-24-2006

04:40pm

From: Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld

3371023

T-380

P.0027003

F-074

Case 3:06-cv-01893-JCS Document 12 Filed 09/11/06 Page 1 of 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Larry Totton, et al.

CASE NO. 06-cv-11893

Plaintiff(s),

v.

Vio Soto Landscaping, Inc.

STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
ORDER SELECTING ADR PROCESS

Defendant(s).

Counsel report that they have met and conferred regarding ADR and have reached the following stipulation pursuant to Civil L.R. 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5:

The parties agree to participate in the following ADR process:

Court Processes:

Non-binding Arbitration (ADR L.R. 4)

Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE) (ADR L.R. 5)

✓ Mediation (ADR L.R. 6)

(Note: Parties who believe that an early settlement conference with a Magistrate Judge is appreciably more likely to meet their needs than any other form of ADR, must participate in an ADR phone conference and may not file this form. They must instead file a Notice of Need for ADR Phone Conference. See Civil Local Rule 16-8 and ADR L.R. 3-5)

Private Process:

Private ADR (please identify process and provider) _____

The parties agree to hold the ADR session by:

✓ the presumptive deadline (The deadline is 90 days from the date of the order referring the case to an ADR process unless otherwise ordered.)

other requested deadline _____

Dated: 8/25/06

Dated: 8/24/06

Concepcion E.
Lozano-Batista

C. Lozano
Attorney for Plaintiff

Susan Bishop
Attorney for Defendant

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Pursuant to the Stipulation above, the captioned matter is hereby referred to:

- Non-binding Arbitration
- Early Neutral Evaluation (ENE)
- ☒ Mediation
- Private ADR

Deadline for ADR session

- ☒ 90 days from the date of this order.
- other

IT IS SO ORDERED.

9/11/06

Dated: _____

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Claudia Witt", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE